# AGENCY ESTIMATE

OF THE FISCAL IMPACT OF IMPLEMENTING

## 2nd Sub. S.B. 60 2011 General Session

Pilot Accountability Permit Program and Identity Related Amendments

Sponsor:Sen. Luz RoblesLead Analyst:Ben LeishmanAgency Contact:Sean Thomas 4 Mar 2011Title:Audit & Finance Specialist

Agency Utah State Office of Education Office: 801-538-7802 Cell: 801-403-4841

21. OHOLL I OHIL (101 bills that have no impact on the state, local governments, businesses, of individua	$\operatorname{nort} \operatorname{Form}$ (For bills that have no impact on the state, local governments,	, businesses	or individuals
---	---	--------------	----------------

If you can check all five boxes to the right, you're almost done. If the bill obviously doesn't have an impact, you're done.

X There is no fiscal impact on local governments.
X There is no fiscal impact on businesses
There is no fiscal impact on individuals.
The bill will not affect revenues.

If it isn't so obvious, explain what's going on. The most usual explanation is the codification of existing practices.

Attachments welcome.

If necessary,	explain	why	this	bill	has	no	fiscal	impact.	

State agencies will not require an appropriation to implement the bill.

В	. 1	W	hat	parts	of	the	bill	cause	fiscal	impact	2
---	-----	---	-----	-------	----	-----	------	-------	--------	--------	---

Cite specific sections or line numbers.

Lines 558 thru 589

### C. Which program gets the appropriation?

Enter 3 letter Appropriation Unit Code.

For n	ultip	le ap	propri	iations
This is		of		

### D. Work Notes: Assumptions, calculations & what are we buying?

Explain the fiscal impact in plain English, detailing your assumptions, methods, & calculations.

List all direct costs. Identify one-time and ongoing costs. Detail FTE impacts.

Do not say, "\$50,000 in Current Expense." Be very specific about what this \$50,000 will buy.

Attachments encouraged.

See the attached tab titled "Fiscal Impact Projection". The impact has been estimated based on Assumptions (items in **Black**) and Projections (items in **Blue**). The Legislative Fiscal Analyst can change assumptions by changing the items in **Black** which will change the Projections in **Blue**. The impact estimate contemplates that the Legislature would allocate revenues from the Restricted Account indicated in Section 53-16-203 of 2nd Sub SB 60 to the Utah State Office of Education in order to cover a portion of start up and ongoing costs for administration of its portion of the Program. Further the estimate assumes the testing contractors will remit an add on fee to the USOE to further defray the cost. Based on an assumption of 10,000 permit seekers in the initial year, and a reasonable add-on fee for the permit process and testing process, start up costs could be recovered over the first three years of the program. This assumes the program would be renewed for that period. **PART D. CONTINUED BELOW** -

#### E. REVENUES

Select Fund

Uniform School Fund

Current Budget Year FY 2011 Coming Budget Year FY 2012

240,000

Future Budget Year FY 2013

240,000

To	tal 0	240,000	240,000				
F. COSTS by FUND  Select Fund  Current Budget Year  Coming Budget Year  Future Budget Year  Five and F							
Uniform School Fund	FY 2011	FY 2012 298,889	FY 2013 183,889				
To	tal 0	298,889	183,889				
Travel Current Expense DP Current Expense DP Capital Outlay Capital Outlay Other/Pass Thru To	tal 0	298,889	183,889				
H. Non-State Impa	ICTS Your estimate of	f how will the bill affect:					
Local Governments  Certain School Districts and other community organizations provide the Alternative, Adult Education and GED Testing Services Program run through the State Office of Education. They would provide much of the infrastructure for this							
Businesses new testing program.							
Individuals  Individuals who wish to obtain Permit A or Permit B will be required to pay for the							

**PART D. CONTINUED -** However, if that testing level is not met, or the program is not renewed, it is possible that costs would NOT be recovered through testing and permitting fee revenue. The revenues shown in Section E. would be derived from the appropriation and add-on testing fee. In evaluation with internal staff, it appears the most cost effective way to administer the record retention portion of the testing program is to adjust current systems in place at the USOE, rather than at the Contractor level. Please call with any questions, comments, or requests for additional information.

This is a draft fiscal note response from the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and may be revised in the future.

2010 Version 11.09

costs of 160 hours of aggregrate training and any testing costs.

Attachments welcome.

S.B. 60 - PILOT ACCOUNTABILITY PERMIT PROGRAM AND IDENTITY RELATED AMENDMENTS						
	Assumptions	Projections				
Approximate number of undocumented workers in Utah - 2009 estimate	110,000	110,000				
Estimated number of total tests (English and Civics) on an annual basis	10,000	10,000				
Estimated number of required testing facilities - State wide distribution	11	11				
Program Start Up Costs						
Rule Drafting and Processing	\$10,000	\$10,000				
Procurement Process to contract with Third Party Administrators for Adult Testing	\$5,000	\$55,000				
Minimum projected cost to adjust current database of test history and outcomes, and record retention	\$50,000	\$50,000				
Ongoing Program Costs						
Program Coordinator - Adult Testing, and Minor Testing Documentation Coordinator, Proficiency Standards	\$148,889	\$148,889				
Additional Administrative Costs and Expenses	\$35,000	\$35,000				
State Appropriation - Annualized Fixed Costs in First Year of S.B. 60		\$298,889				
Annualized Fixed Costs in subsequent years of S.B. 60		\$183,889				
Ongoing State Appropriation		\$183,889				
Program Revenue for increase in permit fee for Restricted Account per Section 53-16-203	\$12	\$120,000				
Program Revenue for increase in testing fee to be remitted to USOE by Contractors	\$12	\$120,000				
Total Revenue to offset costs		\$240,000				